



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,107

04/01/2005

Kinnichi Yamada

10873.1665USWO

9647

52835 7590 06/21/2007

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.

P.O. BOX 2902

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902

EXAMINER

PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/530,107

Applicant(s)

YAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeong S. Park

Art Unit

2109

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/5/2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 2 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2, line 5, the phrase "device information" should be corrected as --the device information-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claim 7, line 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delph (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,104 B1) in view of Parry et al. (hereinafter Parry)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0179112 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Delph teaches as follows:

A data relay device (intermediate server, 501 in figure 1) for connecting to a network (Internet, 40 in figure 1) a data generating device (host computer, 80 in figure 1) generating data (host data) in different formats (a host computer sends host data to an intermediate server interfaced with a network, see, abstract), comprising;

A data receiving portion for receiving the data from a data generating device (an intermediate server receives data from a host computer, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 3-4); and

A converting portion (conversion program) for converting the data received by the data receiving portion into a common format (an intermediate server translates the data with a conversion program into a format common to a network, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 4-6) that is processable by other devices (a pluralities of receiver computers, 90 in figure 1) on the network (an intermediate server sends the translated data through the network to a plurality of the receiver computers, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 6-8).

Delph does not teach the plurality of kinds of data generating devices generating data in different formats but teach a data generating device (a host computer, 80 in figure 1).

Parry teaches as follows:

A system automatically converting data received from a remote device;

A data conversion system is coupled to at least a first remote device;

The conversion device is configured to receive information from at least the first remote device, wherein the information is configured to enable conversion of data from a first format to a second format (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0007]); and

Remote devices generating data in different formats (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0020], lines 12-15 and figure 1).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delph to include a plurality of kinds of data generating devices as taught by Parry in order to provide data conversion for the plurality of kinds of data generating devices between multiple different data formats with single data conversion device.

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Delph teaches as follows:

A conversion program storing portion for storing a conversion program for causing the converting portion to conduct a conversion processing according to the kind of each of the data generating devices (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 1-4).

Delph does not teach as follows:

A conversion program obtaining portion for determining whether a conversion program for a data generating device is stored in the conversion program storing portion when the data generating device is newly connected and, if not, requesting the conversion program.

Parry teaches as follows:

The conversion device (10 in figure 1) is configured to recognize what format the data is currently in and what format the data is to be converted into. If the conversion device does not have the available resources to perform the conversion, the conversion device is configured to look for outside help (foreign device, 11 in figure 1)(see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033], lines 1-12); and

A conversion program storing device (foreign device, 11 in figure 1) for storing conversion programs for various kinds of the data generating devices (the foreign device may have the available resources to perform the conversion, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033], lines 12-20).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delph to include a feature of determining whether a conversion program for the data is stored in the conversion program storing portion or not as taught

by Parry in order to provide data conversion for all different kinds of data formats by outsourcing a conversion program when the conversion device cannot provide the correct conversion program.

Regarding claims 5, 10 and 11, Delph teaches as follows:

An analyzing portion for extracting a feature of the data received from the data generating device, thereby specifying the kind of the connected data generating device (Since the data generating device has Intranet, 140 in figure 2, connection to the relay device, specifying the kind of the connected data generating device is inherent feature from the Intranet connection, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 18-21 and figure 2).

Regarding claim 6, Delph and Parry teach all the limitations of claim as explained above per claim 1, also Delph teaches as follows:

The data generating devices (host computer, 80 and 180 in figure 2) are connected to a data management device (local storage device, 60 and 160 in figure 2) on the network (Internet 40 and Intranet 140 in figure 2)(see, e.g., col. 4, line 44 and col. 5, lines 65-66); and

The data management device (local storage device, 60 and 160 in figure 2) processes the data from the data generating devices in the common format (local storage device stores the translated host data in common format, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 12, Delph and Parry teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 9 as explained above, also Delph teaches as follows:

The interconnection between two intermediate servers (50 and 150 in figure 2)

through HTTP tunnel (210 in figure 2)(see, e.g., col. 6, lines 46-48).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delph and Parry to include a connection to other data relay device in order to share the conversion programs through existing network connection.

Regarding claim 13, Delph and Parry teach all the limitations of claims 6 and 9 as explained above, also Parry teaches as follows:

If the conversion device does not have the available resources to perform the conversion, the conversion device is configured to look for outside help from foreign devices (11 in figure 1)(see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033], lines 9-12).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delph and Parry to include periodic access to the conversion program storing device (foreign device) for conversion program updating in order to automatically update the conversion program from the conversion program storing device.

4. Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delph (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,104 B1) and Parry et al. (hereinafter Parry)(U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0179112 A1) in view of Yuki (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0165984 A1).

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Delph teaches that setting-up session communication between host computer (80 in figure 1) and intermediate server (50 in figure 1), wherein exchanging each device's information is inherent (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 6-12).

Parry teaches that a remote device (5 in figure 1) is configured to communicate electronically with the conversion device (10 in figure 1), wherein the electronic

communication implicitly discloses the device information exchanges between two devices (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0021]).

Delph and Parry do not disclose explicit teaching of collecting connected device's information and updating the connected device information in the data relay device.

Yuki teaches as follows:

Providing a device information renewal system for use in a network in which a computer terminal (11 in figure 12, working as a data relay device) and image forming devices (13 in figure 12, working as a data generating device) are connected (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014], lines 1-4);

A storing unit on the computer terminal receives device information of image forming devices and stores in a memory of the terminal as old device information (13 in figure 12)(see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014], lines 5-10);

A comparison unit receives new device information of image forming devices and old device information from the storing unit and determines whether the new device information matches with the old device information (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014], lines 10-15); and

A renewal unit renews the old device information stored in the memory of the terminal with the new device information (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014], lines 15-19).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Delph and Parry to include collecting connected device's information and updating the connected device information in the computer terminal as taught by

Yuki in order to efficiently renew the device information of the connected devices.

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Delph teaches as follows:

A device information sending portion (intermediate server 50 and 150 in figure 2) for sending the device information received from the data generating device (host data) to a data management device (local storage device 60 and 160 in figure 2) for processing the data from the data generating device via the network (intermediate server stores translated host data into the local storage device and receiver computer contacts intermediate server through Internet using a single URL, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 65-67).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is 571-270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2109

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP
May 21, 2007

NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2:00

